

April 15

ment should be handled so as generally to reinforce expansionary fiscal and monetary policies."

A Federal deficit of sizable proportions must be financed during 1963-64, regardless of whether action is taken to reduce taxes. Indeed, as we have earlier pointed out, the cumulative deficit to be financed over the next 3 fiscal years will be smaller if an effective tax reduction and reform program is adopted, than if no such action is taken.

Under present conditions of high unemployment and excess capacity, debt management must be handled in ways which generally reinforce the needed expansionary fiscal and monetary policies. Baseless fears of inflation or balance-of-payments considerations must not be allowed to constrain public debt operations occasioned by the transitional budget deficits.

These considerations dictate that "lengthening the debt" should be given less weight for a while. This is no occasion for large amounts of Treasury borrowing at long term, since this places the Treasury in competition with the demands of private businesses and individuals for investment funds. Furthermore, Treasury borrowing on short term under these conditions may actually aid the balance of payments by supporting domestic short-term interest rates while weakening long-term rates. To the extent that changes in short-term interest rates have any influence on international capital flows, such a policy would be all to the good.

On the other hand, there is no reason to pursue a policy of extreme shortening of the debt structure. To the extent that the Treasury enters the long end of the market, they should do so via the auction method of selling Government bonds. This is a policy we have urged repeatedly in the past. The Treasury is commended for its initial exploratory move in this direction, and for the success which attended the sale of the \$250 million issue of bonds of 1988-93 on January 8, 1963. We recommend that the practice of offering longer and medium-term Treasury bonds at competitive bidding be employed regularly and be made an established part of debt management practices.

The United States has for some years faced the problem of bringing its balance of payments under control in a manner consistent with its objectives of maximum employment and a more rapid rate of growth of the domestic economy. We reject the notion that the United States must raise domestic interest rates or follow restrictive fiscal policies—causing a low growth rate and high domestic unemployment—in order to solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. Indeed, the strength of the dollar ultimately depends on the strength and growth of the underlying U.S. economy.

The committee is of the conviction—shared by responsible authorities in Europe—that the United States must move rapidly toward maximum employment, production, and more rapid growth.

### Authorizing Virgin Islands To Issue General Obligation Bonds

SPEECH  
OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize the Government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to prolong this discussion. I think we have a practical situation here, but I do think before we vote on this amendment it is my responsibility as manager of the bill to point out that the committee instructed us to support the bill as it appears as reported by the committee. While I am inclined to limit this to certain specific activity, I do think we should be aware of the fact that too often in this Congress when it comes to legislating for offshore areas, where the people are not citizens in the full sense, we are inclined to adopt a double rule. We have one rule for those on the mainland and we have another rule for the offshore areas.

I intend to support the amendment because it is the practical thing to do, but I do not intend to support it in a paternalistic way or attitude toward those people because I think they have as much responsibility and ability to govern as any municipal council throughout the country.

### Cuba and Broken Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an article on U.S. foreign policy with regard to Cuban communism as prepared by Mr. Hugh J. Boyd, principal of Lake View High School in Lake View, S.C., in eloquently expressing his opinions in U.S. handling of the Cuban problem. Mr. Boyd has reflected much of the sentiment that I have detected among my constituents in South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an impressive column by Mr. Robert Morris, of Dallas, Tex., entitled "Broken Treaties"; and also my newsletter of April 8, 1963, which, like Mr. Boyd's article and Mr. Morris' column, is also on the subject of Cuba.

There being no objection, the article, column, and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE CUBA OF TYRANNY

(By Hugh J. Boyd)

It's time for us of the United States to stop our wrist-slapping of those Cubans who are making heroic efforts to destroy a few of the vermin who have occupied their homeland. Our own people constantly remind us that we might anger someone if we allow such activity to continue. Some say we must tread lightly or we will step on some little Red toe. We have heard so much of this that we are beginning to draw the conclusion that our country, the United States, is afraid to put its foot down anywhere for fear of its touching the ground. We are told it is better to wait.

What are we waiting for? When are we supposed to get mad? What side are we on

anyway? Have we so perverted our sense of justice and reasoning that we now condemn those who would gladly strike for freedom, knowing full well the possible if not inevitable consequences? Have we forgotten the courage displayed by our own heroes who struck for freedom against overwhelming odds and won.

To those who say, "Oh, we must not let them do such things, the blood will be on our hands," we say, "On whose hands is the blood of all those who have died under the oppression in Cuba? Is it not already dripping from the hands of those who for reasons of poor judgment, or pure ignorance are responsible for the rise of Castro?" This we cannot justify, but we can certainly face up to our responsibility, admit a mistake, and make every attempt to free Cuba of its tyranny.

As to a fear of war, this seems stupid; for have not the little rats run for their holes each time their hand has been called? Certainly, no one wants to die, but neither does anyone want to survive in a living hell. This is the blueprint for us, the United States, for the Americas, and every time we give in, or back up, or fail to support those who fight hand-to-hand combat with the Communist, we are asking for just that living hell. Every time we show embarrassment at a mistake—or apologize as we withdraw from an impasse—the beady-eyed little tramps sharpen their teeth for a little larger bite—and lick their chops with a little more anticipation.

The Communists, as individuals, are a weak, slimy lot—the fishy handshakers. Certainly, they are devoted to their cause and collectively they are strong; individually they are cowards, losing themselves in a cause for the simple reason they lack the courage to face the world's problems as individuals. It's about time we reduced them to the sniveling, incipient denominator which is common to all of them; and if not actually act to annihilate, at least to aid and abet those who are devoted to that cause. It's time we pictured ourselves in the position of the Cubans for a few minutes with the stinging tears of anger and insult streaming down their faces, seeking only one thing in life: the privilege of going home to live in peace. We say that we cannot help them, in fact we say we must prevent such provocative attacks against those who occupy Cuba for we run the risk of starting a war.

Is there one among us who believes that if the Communists believed that they could destroy us that they would hesitate one minute with or without provocation, or righteous justification. To whom do they have to answer, or to whom must they plead for mercy for such a sin against mankind? They know no God. There is no consciousness of right or wrong, only that which says "we can win, or we can lose," which would serve to stay their execution of us in their distorted "hall of justice."

Make no mistake, when the Communists think they can win, they will strike; until then, and this need not ever be if we seize the initiative, they will continue to head for the ratholes when we show the necessary determination. Of course, they will continue to grow away at our freedoms while still "holed up," creating new pockets of resistance which we must also ferret out and destroy. Give them no peace anywhere.

The dictates of commonsense demand that we take cognizance of the fact that we are losing a war; that there are those who sincerely want to win in their struggle for freedom. We must help them, but more than this, we must realize that we, you and I, are much more involved in international affairs than were our predecessors when entering World War I and World War II; and yet we are still sitting on our too-wide "dead ends," doing absolutely nothing.

It is time the United States set its foot down, and, if necessary, make the whole of

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Korean war, to 1961, total liquid assets held by the public have fallen from 85.9 percent to 78.2 percent of 1961 gross national product. It has been up somewhat in late 1962, returning to the 1957 levels. Recent evidence, coupled with the statement of the Chairman of the Board of Governors that some lessening of ease was decided upon in December 1962, shows that the authorities are already returning to the pattern which prevailed before this year-end increase in the ratio of liquid assets to gross national product.

"We again recommend that the monetary authorities provide the basis for secular increases in the money supply as the economy grows, through open market purchases of longer term Federal Securities, rather than by lowering reserve requirements."

We have in the past repeatedly recommended that the Federal Reserve provide the basis for an expanding money supply for our growing economy by open market purchases of longer term Federal securities. This policy gives the taxpayer a break through return to the Treasury of earnings of the Federal Reserve on such security holdings, instead of providing a free gift of earnings to the private banking system as occurs when expansion is provided through the lowering of reserve requirements. In addition, such open market purchases of longer term securities help the Treasury lengthen the debt, and tend to keep prices of longer term securities up and interest rates on these securities lower than would otherwise be the case. In turn, lower interest rates in the long end of the market tend to encourage investment, particularly in plant, equipment, and housing, which contributes to a higher rate of long-term economic growth. We can see no excuse for any other policy.

The monetary authorities have been going directly contrary to this committee's recommendation on this matter. They have reduced reserve requirements. The recent report of the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency indicates that further reductions in reserve requirements are under consideration. The Joint Economic Committee, therefore, requests that the monetary authorities advise this committee before taking any further actions which run contrary to this committee's repeated recommendation that secular increases in the money supply be provided through open market purchases of longer term Federal securities rather than by lowering reserve requirements.

"We disapprove of the action of the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee in December 1962 when it moved to tighten monetary conditions. Tight money is not now needed either to fight inflation or to 'protect the dollar.'"

The hope that monetary policy will aid, rather than hinder, fiscal measures was vitiated by the ready confession of the Chairman of the Board of Governors to this committee on February 1, 1963, under questioning: "I will say to you now that you are correct in your analysis that the Federal Reserve is pursuing a slightly less easy policy." This statement was made in answer to a question as to whether policy had changed in December 1962, for the first time in 2½ years. The Chairman of the Board of Governors did not satisfactorily explain the grounds for even a slight deliberate tightening of credit. The change of policy was confirmed and reasons for the action were set forth in the record of the Open Market Committee's actions for 1962 that was made available to the committee after the hearings in response to our request. The action still seems to us both perplexing and premature.

It is thoroughly irrational to tighten monetary conditions while business activity is unsatisfactory, unemployment is high, large amounts of our capacity are idle, and the price level is stable. We hope that, if

Congress should enact tax reduction measures, the monetary authorities will demonstrate enough faith in the judgment of Congress to lend their active aid and cooperation well in advance of the need for financing a deficit. They should not wait idly by while a tight credit situation is allowed to develop because of rising business credit requirements in an economy striving to grow.

Not even the balance-of-payments argument about "protecting the dollar" provides excuse for tighter money and higher interest rates. The extensive hearings of our Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments provided no evidence that differentials in interest rates between United States and foreign countries provide any substantial stimulus to capital outflows and hence to gold losses and a deficit in our balance of payments. Indeed, evidence points to many other factors, such as the needs of trade, and so forth, as being of far greater importance.

A distinguished Swiss economist, amplifying views expressed to the committee by other international witnesses, emphasized that—

"In general, it must be recognized that international capital flows do not depend just on interest rates, but on interest rates plus the state of confidence in the currency concerned.

"If this confidence is high, a country may be able to sustain very low rates, thus Switzerland probably has about the lowest interest rates anywhere.

"If, on the other hand, this confidence is shaken, even rather high interest rates may be insufficient to stabilize capital flows. In fact, some of the money the United States has been losing in recent months was going to a country with even lower rates, that is, Switzerland. Conversely, Germany found in 1960-61 that low rates did not stop the influx of foreign money."

Additional evidence against the overemphasis on differential interest rates lies in the relative smallness of recent differentials. When the risks of foreign exchange are insured, rate differentials have at times been in favor of New York. In any case the advantage or disadvantage has been small and swinging back and forth, with major difference easily accounted for by the special circumstances, e.g., those involving Canadian exchange, which have tended to outweigh interest considerations.

Several empirical studies presented during the year likewise suggest that the needs of commerce for strategically placed working balances, tax considerations and other non-interest-rate factors are far more likely to be primary forces behind short-term capital movements than are modest opportunities for interest arbitrage.

The Nation has now been brought to the active consideration of tax reduction for economic stimulation. Even if such measures are adopted and succeed, we will nonetheless require domestic monetary expansion. Instead of continuing to rely upon an asserted need for relatively high interest rates, we think that trade expansion and other avenues offer the preferable approach to the serious balance-of-payments problem.

Raising interest rates for balance-of-payments reasons can also be ruled out because such action merely provides an opportunity for other countries to raise interest rates. A competitive race toward higher interest rates would not be in the interest of this country or of other economies abroad. In fact, with postwar inflationary pressures eliminated, the case for a somewhat lower structure of interest rates is overpowering. To the extent that international capital movements provide any basis for corrective action at this time, the appropriate remedy is to be found in a multilateral payments agreement of the type suggested later in this report. The alterna-

tive of stifling our economy through high interest rates is unconscionable.

"The Federal Reserve must either be persuaded or compelled by law to institute a better and more timely system of reporting to the Congress and the public the actions taken by the Open Market Committee and the Board of Governors, together with the specific reasons for such actions."

The Federal Reserve is a direct servant of the Congress. It acts solely as the agent of Congress in carrying out its functions of controlling the supply of money. This power is given to Congress by the Constitution and the Federal Reserve authorities merely act for Congress under delegated powers. By both law and sound principle, the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee must report their actions to Congress, together with their reasons for taking these actions. This information must be so explicit and clear that Congress can reasonably judge whether the monetary authorities have exercised the delegated monetary powers in accord with congressional instructions and in the national interest. The reports also must be timely, and hence should be submitted to Congress in time for their review by this committee in connection with its annual hearings on the President's Economic Reports; that is, by January 20.

The report of actions, and the reasons for actions taken, as is set forth in the Board of Governors annual report, have been notoriously inadequate, uninformative, and confusing, as this committee has noted in the past. We are quite disappointed to discover in the record of actions for 1962 no significant improvement in this respect.

The meeting of December 18, 1962, at which a change in policy took place is typical. A few phrases from that record are illustrative of the unsatisfactory character of the record. At this meeting it will be remembered that while the country was talking about the need to stimulate the economy by tax reductions, the Open Market Committee was deciding upon a contrary program of less monetary ease. From the report of the meetings we learn what everyone knew, that "evidence of solid additional achievement was still limited," or, to use the words of the directive, "recognizes the unsatisfactory level of domestic activity, the continuing underutilization of resources, and the absence of inflationary pressures." In spite of these preponderant considerations, clearly dictating no less "ease" in the money markets, that committee voted 7 to 5 for "maintaining a firmer tone in the money markets while continuing to provide moderate reserve expansion in the banking system." The contradiction in this portion of the directive calling at once for a "firmer tone" and "moderate expansion," confusing as it is, does not obscure the fact, as Chairman Martin told this committee in his oral testimony, that a new policy of less ease had been instituted.

The most disturbing aspect of the problem is the conclusion implied by their 1962 report, if we can accept it as a complete, clear, and accurate record. The confused nature of their annual report and the vague words of the so-called "directives" suggest that the monetary authorities themselves have hazy and unclear concepts of what they are trying to do. When one undertakes to give operational significance to such expressions as "somewhat" less ease, "moderate" expansion or similar differences, the confusion is not necessarily that of the observers but more probably that of the actors. We would prefer to think that this is not the case but the alternative is to believe that the authorities are unable to make an effective report on their policies. This matter remains a troublesome issue involving the relationship of Congress with one of its own agents.

"Under present conditions of high unemployment and excess capacity, debt manage-

South America shake with its thunder. When the "commies" set tail and run from there, follow them to their nests, ferret them out, and make them continue until they are again back in their own paradise with Niki or Maw. There is certainly such a thing as righteous anger.

#### BROKEN TREATIES (By Robert Morris)

There was a day when the image we cast around the world was the subject of deep preoccupation on the part of our leaders. If this were so today the mood of those concerned would be one of abject shame.

A few years ago our present Chief Executive complained that we were not sufficiently helping Cuban exiles to restore freedom to their homeland. Later he stated that we could not tolerate a Soviet satellite on our doorstep.

The spectacle for all to see today is that we are indeed tolerating a Soviet satellite at our doorstep. Dramatizing that abject fact, we are conspicuously apprehending, even illegally, not the Castro agents who are radiating from Cuba to destroy freedom in Latin America but the Cuban exiles who aspire to free their homeland.

How dread must this spectacle appear to the people of Central and South America, the next targets of Castro and Khrushchev, particularly in the light of other reflections of the underlying abject mood?

The legal framework that solemnly exists today is clear. Not only do we have the Monroe Doctrine but it has been specifically implemented by the treaties of Rio de Janeiro, Caracas and Punta del Este. These are serious treaties under which we pledged to eradicate not only Soviet power but Soviet ideology from the hemisphere. A Soviet beachhead is proscribed. We are expressly committed by these solemn pacts not to tolerate it, coexist with it or guarantee its integrity. Yet we are patently flouting these compacts.

The Cuban exiles, on the other hand, apparently take the solemnity of these OAS treaties seriously and we now know what is in store for them. We even seize them, and have them seized, in international waters without waiting until they come within our territorial waters.

Of course despair prevails among the Cubans. To show how deeply committed to this illegal posture, emotionally, our State Department people are, they even smear, with dishonorable leaks to the press, the leader of the Cubans in exile.

As if to mock the folly of this Cuban performance, the similar mood of surrender that we engaged in with respect to Laos is now turning into a possible disaster.

In Laos, as in Cuba, to induce Khrushchev to keep his word we pressured General Nostan's forces, the loyal Laotians, to cease resistance to the Communists and enter into a Soviet-leaning coalition government, on the trolka basis.

The pro-Western forces withdrew militarily, according to their pledges. The pro-Soviet forces, reflecting their nature, not only did not withdraw from strategic positions but aggressively moved forward, with augmented strength, from North Vietnam.

Now Secretary Dean Rusk complains that the Communists are not keeping their word. In other words in 1963 he is still attributing to them what have been our standards and our meaning of "keeping one's word." The Communist meaning of a treaty is officially set forth—and put to practice thousands of times—"treaties like pie crusts, are made only to be broken." They will keep a pledge only as long as it serves their purpose.

But an even more chilling spectacle can be found by looking ahead. If we, by our example and by our flouting of protective treaties, continue to crush resistance to Soviet power in Latin America, one country

after another will topple. Strategic Brazil and British Guiana are already well on the way.

Castro's agents are moving aggressively ahead. When the leaders of Central America showed signs of taking protective action against Soviet power, our Chief Executive went there to discourage them, promising nevertheless to aid them in stopping subversion.

The subversion—even sabotage—however, continues. Our State Department is not lifting a finger. No, I am wrong, they are lifting a finger—a forbidding finger but the finger is directed at Frances Knight, the competent head of the Passport Division of the State Department who wants to deny passports to Soviet agents going abroad to further world communism.

As we have pointed out, previously, Miss Knight has testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that her superiors forced her to issue passports to 547 persons she knew to be Communists, who were going abroad, obviously to subvert.

The conditioned American who does not seem to be disturbed at the prospect of a Communist Latin America should think twice when he beholds the trend toward control over our destiny by the United Nations. There we of the West are a minority today. But if we lose the supporting Latin American bloc that makes us somewhat respectable in this minority position, we will be almost alone, surrounded by our enemies, but this time—helpless.

#### A CHOICE FOR AMERICANS (By Senator STROM THOMPSON)

The raids carried out by Cuban exiles against Castro and Russian Communist forces in Cuba have inspired a reaction of official displeasure from the United States. U.S. reaction has been expressed in both action and words. The action has been in the form of arrests of some Cubans in the United States suspected of participating in the raids. Verbally, the United States has officially characterized the raids as irrational.

The actions taken by the United States may have less effect on the Cuban raiders than the raiders themselves have on the combined Castro-Soviet military grip on Cuba. The raiders, so far as is known, do not operate directly from U.S. soil. Those not arrested have announced their intention of continuing their anti-Communist raids.

Verbal expressions of displeasure unleashed by U.S. officials against the Cuban raiders may, in the long run, have a far graver significance than the official U.S. actions, for they will surely be interpreted as an indicator of U.S. policy toward all those who rise up in arms against their Communist captors and rulers.

The Cuban raiders have been labeled "irrational" by State Department spokesmen. However badly the actions of the Cuban raiders may conflict with real or imagined U.S. interests, the charging of Cuban raiders with irrationality ill becomes Americans, of all people.

Cuban refugees have lost much, including their homes, their jobs, friends, loved ones, and above all, their liberty. Political asylum in a foreign land is no substitute. Having lost virtually all else, is it "irrational" for them now to risk their lives, even against hopeless odds, when there appears no other hope that their country will soon escape the terror, hunger, and captivity of Communist tyranny? After all, it is a fact that no country which has been taken behind the Iron Curtain has ever been freed, and the United States has never supported any movements toward liberation.

The Cuban raiders are by no means the first men to gamble against seemingly hopeless odds to gain liberty. Almost 187 years ago, other men, against almost equally hope-

less odds, undertook to free their country from foreign tyranny, and to this end, they pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. To American patriots in 1776, there was no other honorable course. So it may seem to Cuban refugees today.

The Cubans are not alone in their plight, however. Millions in eastern Europe, in the Balkan states, in Korea, on the mainland of China, even in non-Russian areas of the U.S.S.R. itself, are suffering from the same tyranny. There are those among these peoples who may again reach the limit of their endurance and conclude that they have no other honorable course but to rise up against hopeless odds.

Would the official reaction of the U.S. Government to such an uprising be condemnation for "irrationality"? Were the uprisings in East Germany 1953 "irrational"? Was the uprising in Hungary in 1956 an example of "irrational" conduct? Both these events caused a crisis in relations between the Communists and the free world. According to our policymakers, had the United States actively supported these uprisings, or even threatened to interfere with Soviet efforts to crush the uprisings, there would have been a risk of escalation into general war. For those who participated in the uprisings, the risk was already total—and most of them paid with their lives, either in the fighting, or in the executions which followed.

For the United States to align itself with the aspirations of captive peoples for liberty involves a risk. It has been and is official U.S. policy to discourage "non-evolutionary changes" in Communist-held countries in hope of minimizing the risk of war to the United States. It also keeps us on the defensive against the constant efforts of the Communists to continue extending their tyranny worldwide.

Captive people all over the world will recognize in the charge of "irrationality" against Cuban raiders the U.S. policy of minimizing the risk—to Americans. Indeed, it may for them be the "convincer" that captive peoples can never hope to gain American support for their liberty hopes, and trigger against Communist rulers uprisings born of the belief that the future holds no better odds for throwing off the tyranny of communism than the present. At some such point, all Americans, and not just their policymakers, must face the sober choice—to minimize the risks to ourselves, or like our ancestors, to pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to the cause of liberty.

#### The Rev. James Logan Delk of Kentucky

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news article published in the Lexington Leader of Thursday, April 11, 1963, relating to the death of the Reverend James Logan Delk.

Dr. Delk was born in Tennessee, near the birthplace and home of World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York, whom he knew well. Yet he lived a great part of his life in Kentucky, and was a citizen of the State.

While always actively engaged in the ministry, he took a great interest in governmental affairs and politics—and several times was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senate and other offices. He was known by many in public life in Kentucky, and throughout the Nation, of both parties.

I had known Dr. Delk for many years, and while we belonged to different political parties, I valued his friendship. He was a colorful figure, a good friend, and a man whose great interest was in helping the poor, the unemployed, the sick—all those who are less fortunate than their fellow Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUISVILLE, Ky.—The Reverend James Logan Delk ran for sheriff of Christian County nearly 40 years ago. He lost.

Persistently, the stern, dignified evangelist tried five times for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator. Each time he lost.

Once he sought the party nomination for Governor. Again he lost.

But Delk was a man who could laugh at his political misfortune—and run for office again.

"I've never won yet but I'm not discouraged. The great Abraham Lincoln tried 13 times before he was elected," Delk once said.

This year, he sought the Democratic nomination for Governor again. It was his last political effort.

Delk died at the age of 75 Tuesday at Jamestown, Tenn., not far from his native Pall Mall. He became ill this winter and left Frankfort, his home for 11 years, to go to Hopkinsville, where a daughter lived.

Delk was a picturesque figure. His long hair curled at the nape. His blue eyes sparkled and he never wore glasses. His hat often was broad-brimmed and white and he carried a cane strictly for effect.

Born in the mountains of north-center Tennessee near the home of World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York, Delk spent his boyhood on the farm.

At 16, he enrolled at God's Bible school in Cincinnati and became an evangelist for the Church of God in Christ. He preached in 48 States, Canada, and Mexico.

Once Delk flew to England for the Pentecostal World Conference. Another time he was a delegate at a church meeting in Toronto. In 1945 he represented his church at the United Nations in San Francisco.

# National President of VFW Auxiliary, Mrs. Merton Tice, Encourages Korean Cottage Program

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as a longtime resident of Mitchell, S. Dak., I am proud of the fact that this city has produced in recent years both a national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and a national president of the VFW auxiliary.

Judge Merton Tice of Mitchell served as national VFW commander for the

years 1954 to 1955. Now, his wife, Elfrieda, is serving as national president of the VFW auxiliary. Both of the Tices have brought an unusual degree of energy, imagination, and force to their leadership responsibilities.

Mrs. Tice and her 16-year-old daughter, Virginia, have recently completed a 21,000 mile tour of the Far East. Their tour was a valuable contribution to our country's interests abroad and its meaning has not been lost on the Tices.

Mrs. Tice came back with a determination to aid the homeless of Korea. She has called upon her auxiliary sisters to throw their support to the project—Courage Cottages—under the auspices of the American-Korean Foundation. Under this plan, a home for a Korean family can be built for less than \$100. Through the efforts of Mrs. Tice and her auxiliary sisters in all parts of the Nation, it is hoped that many Korean families can get out of their mud floor hovels into a respectable cottage. All of us who believe in the promise of a better life for the children of the earth are inspired by Mrs. Tice's courage and energy.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about this worthwhile effort which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of February 9, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### KOREAN HOMES BUILT BY VFW AUXILIARY (By Mary Ann Grossmann)

Many Korean mothers and their babies no longer will live in thatched mud huts or GI surplus cook tents by the time Mrs. Merton Tice finishes her current tour of duty as national president of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary.

Energetic Mrs. Tice, of Mitchell, S. Dak., is in the Twin Cities through Sunday paying her official visit to the VFW Minnesota Auxiliary.

"I took office in Minneapolis last August during our national convention," Mrs. Tice said, "and at that time I chose as my theme 'Women of Courage.' Now I'm here to tell the auxiliary members how we can be women of courage."

Mrs. Tice said she found the real meaning of women of courage during a recent 21,000-mile trip through the Far East. She and her 16-year-old daughter saw Okinawa, Korea, Manila, and Hong Kong.

"We went to see the seamy side of life," she admitted. "And we saw just that. Keeping away from luncheons, balls, and parties, we saw refugees in Korea and the conditions under which those women live."

It was in a resettlement center just north of Seoul, Korea, that Mrs. Tice reached a decision about how to implement the auxiliary's international woman-to-woman project.

"This settlement is run by the American-Korean Foundation, and they need help. This is where I got the idea of courage cottages—inexpensive cottages that can be built by the Koreans themselves with funds from auxiliary members."

Mrs. Tice hopes that by the time she leaves office all 51 department (State) auxiliaries will have contributed \$100 for a courage cottage.

"This project has really caught the enthusiasm of our members," she smiled, "and it looks as though many local units are going to finance their own courage cottages."

"These cottages are only two-room huts of concrete and mud," she said. "But to people

who have fled before the Communist terror—who literally have no place to lay their heads and shelter their children—a courage cottage is a palace.

"For every \$100 we can give, we are showing that we have a responsibility for those who fight on our side, on the side of world freedom."

Mrs. Tice said that in many resettlement centers throughout the Orient disease is widespread.

"These people need help with housing, schools, and health needs. The Government is helping with their health problems and they take care of their own schools. But housing is what they need help with."

Throughout her journey, Mrs. Tice said she found mothers that realized the advantage of keeping their families away from communism and going to schools which teach freedom.

"Everywhere I talked with people who had terrific pride in their nation," she recalled, "and who wanted their nation to be free."

Besides the courage cottages, Mrs. Tice said, she has two other projects. One is to see that each auxiliary visits a historic spot in their part of the Nation.

The second is for auxiliaries to purchase an album of records telling of 13 incidents in American history. The albums will be donated to hospitals and school libraries.

"I've visited 30 departments since I took office," Mrs. Tice said. "And everywhere I go I sense a new interest among women in the heritage of our Nation, in the history of our country."

Today Mrs. Tice will attend an auxiliary council of administration meeting in the Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis; be guest of honor at a 2 p.m. tea hosted by West St. Paul Auxiliary 4462; and be guest of honor at the VFW and auxiliary annual midwinter dinner in the Radisson.

## The Detergent Problem

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, further evidence of the national scope of the detergent problem appears in the Los Angeles Times of March 27, 1963. The enactment of the detergent control bill (S. 1183) would afford relief from such difficulties. Detergent suds are now creating a traffic hazard near a water reclamation plant at the Whittier Narrows Dam. I ask unanimous consent that a news item from the Los Angeles Times of March 27, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as well as an editorial published the following day, and an article by the science editor dated April 7, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 27, 1963]

#### SUDS FROM DETERGENTS SLOW TRAFFIC

Motorists traveling near Whittier Narrows Dam are grappling with a new traffic hazard—suds.

Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli reported Tuesday that detergent suds from the Whittier Narrows waste water reclamation plant often flood the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Bluff Road.

# Appendix

## Easter: Time for Reflection

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the column by Mr. James Reston in yesterday's New York Times represents a most refreshing point of view. At a time when the Members of Congress are preoccupied with somber fiscal, economic, and security considerations, it is well that we should be reminded from time to time of the spiritual sources of the Nation's strength.

As Mr. Reston puts it:

The philosophers are entitled to their day, especially during the Easter festival. They have been talking about what really saves nations for centuries and advising us on where to place our hopes.

It is fitting that the encyclical of Pope John XXIII, calling for a new effort to establish a world of peace and brotherhood, should come at the Easter season. An editorial appearing in yesterday's New York Times, entitled "The Pope's Message," applauds the efforts of the Pontiff to promote an end to the arms race, disarmament under effective control, and voluntary acceptance by all nations of a world law.

The editor of my hometown newspaper, the Daily Republic, has also applauded recent efforts by Catholic and Protestant laymen and clergymen to explore the possibilities of closer cooperation between the various religious denominations.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article by Mr. Reston, and the editorials from the New York Times and the Daily Republic be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963]

FIERY RUN, VA.—How TO ENDURE WASHINGTON IN ONE EASY LESSON

(By James Reston)

FIERY RUN, VA.—Between the Potomac and the Rappahannock lies one of the loveliest stretches of country in the world. From the tidal water of the Chesapeake Bay, it rolls in ever larger hills to the Blue Ridge, and at this time of year is fringed with green and ablaze with flowering trees.

This is Washington's escape hatch, its retreat from the pit of politics, its consolation and its memory.

The men who make our laws need such a retreat. It widens their perspective. They see farther from here. It reminds them that problems are not new or insoluble, and that there are other laws in the world besides the ones they make in the Federal Capital.

This seems a particularly useful lesson this year. Lately Washington has been overwhelmed by economists. It has been arguing about the price of steel, and the balance of payments, and the outflow of gold, and the export of frozen chickens to Germany, and rates of growth and unemployment, and, of course, it has been arguing about taxes.

#### DEPRESSING ECONOMISTS

All these things are important, but the economists are a depressing lot. The way to salvation, they tell us, is to take a tax cut and grow. The family farm, they tell us, is obsolete. We are producing too much food, so the farmers have to move to the cities where, again, there is too much production and not enough jobs.

It is an ironic situation, but fortunately the philosophers have another view, or at least some different questions. Is a surplus of food a bad thing or a good thing in a starving world? Are we to ask the price of everything and the value of nothing?

Is there another question about the effect of driving people off the land? It is good for the economy, says Walter Heller. But it is bad for the character, says Mr. Jefferson, and, who knows, the old boy may not be so obsolete even now.

Everybody has a tax-free license to reject fear at Easter time and it could be that the economists and the soldiers, who have a vested interest in fear, don't have the whole answer after all.

"Fear plays a greater part in life and in the course of history than we often realize," said Herbert Butterfield, the English philosopher, "and sometimes we know that it is fear which is in operation when individuals and nations are bullying or bragging, or taking a crooked course. . . ."

"There comes a moment when it is a healthy thing to pull every cord tight and make an affirmation of the higher human will. When we seem caught in a relentless historical process, our machines enslaving us and our weapons turning against us, we must certainly not expect to escape save by an unusual assertion of the human spirit . . . everything is going to depend in fact upon what we do over and above the works of self-defense."

This has an old-fashioned sound these days. Washington is not talking much about the human spirit. It is appealing to the mind and not to the heart, and relying on the economist rather than on the philosopher. Moreover, it is preoccupied with defense above everything else: defense of the country from Cuba (of all places), defense of the dollar, defense of "the American way of life," which unfortunately is seldom defined.

Lately, the President has been talking, not about assertions of the human spirit, but about the rhythm of history" and "the rhythm of unemployment," as if success followed failure in these fields as inevitably as spring follows the winter in the rhythm of the seasons.

#### THE PHILOSOPHIC VIEW

The philosophers, however, are entitled to their day, especially during the Easter festival. They have been talking about what really saves nations for centuries and advising us on where to place our hope, and few of them have urged us to bet on the economists.

When Matthew Arnold came to this country over 100 years ago, he was asked how na-

tions were saved. He gave Plato's answer first: nations were saved, Plato said, by "the remnant" of the wise and the good and the righteous.

Then Arnold gave his own answer: "We must hold fast," he said, "to the austere but true doctrine as to what really governs politics and saves or destroys states. Having in mind things true, things elevated, things just, things pure, things amiable, things of good report; having these in mind, studying and loving these, is what save states."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1963]

#### THE POPE'S MESSAGE

The encyclical which Pope John XXIII addressed to all humanity this Easter week has struck a responsive note among millions. Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, Communists and atheists have joined Catholics in approval of the Pope's moving words. This approval will almost certainly be heightened by the extension of the same theme of international cooperation for peace in the Pope's Easter message yesterday.

The feature that sets the Pope's appeal apart from the conventional calls for peace is its generous humanitarianism. John XXIII's basic doctrine is that the common humanity which binds all men and all nations is more important than the doctrinal or racial differences which divide them. On these premises, he calls for an end to the arms race, for disarmament under effective control, and for voluntary acceptance by all nations of a world law.

The most striking demonstration of the Pope's desire for reconciliation of all mankind is in the encyclical's veiled, but unmistakable, references to Communism. Great historical movements, the Pope declares, cannot be simply identified with the vague, false philosophical teachings from which they may have originated. These teachings—the Pope clearly means Marxism-Leninism—remain the same; but the movements themselves may evolve to meet changing historical situations. And as these movements evolve, the Pope concludes, they can come to "contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval." What a blow this attitude deals to the ideological fanatics on both sides of the doctrinal dividing line who reject all idea of a reasonable compromise and think only of burying their opponents.

At the core of the Pope's thinking is the realization that in this thermonuclear era men must learn to live together lest they all die together in the inferno of fusing atoms. To accomplish this, he calls for negotiation, mutual concessions and an understanding of the common interests which unite all of us. This is an inspiring doctrine, the only sane response to the terrible dangers that threaten all life on this planet. It will not be easy to realize this program in a world riddled by suspicions, jealousies and hatreds. But it can be done if the leaders of the world follow the Pope's example and rise above national and doctrinal hatreds that lead only to disaster.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Apr. 6, 1963]

#### CHURCH UNITY HOPES RISE

For the first time in this country, Catholic and Protestant scholars met in 4-day colloquium at Harvard University's Divinity

A2293



A2294

School the last week in March to discuss theological issues. The worldwide movement of Christian unity received fresh impetus from the attendance of Augustine Cardinal Bea, 81, called the Cardinal of Unity, the Vatican's most authoritative spokesman on Christian union.

Theological talks among experts of different Christian persuasions "will undoubtedly yield good results," Cardinal Bea said, but "the way will be long and hard." He delivered three lectures to the interfaith colloquium.

In the first lecture, the Cardinal related scientific research and university training to the quest for Christian unity. He defined the ecumenical attitude as consisting simply in the fact that "we seriously accept the New Testament teaching baptism and its consequences."

In the second lecture, the Cardinal outlined the work of the Vatican Council, listing three positive results: The establishment of an official organ in Rome to foster Christian unity, the presence of non-Catholic observers at the council and a realization that "all Christians belong to each other."

In the third lecture, the Cardinal scanned the prospects for the future. Although emphasizing that nothing could be changed in the doctrines that the Roman Catholic Church regards as essential parts of its divinely revealed faith, he said that developments could be confidently expected in clearing up misunderstandings about church teachings and in doctrinal points which have never been definitely defined. These include the union of Christians with Christ, the membership of non-Catholic Christians in Christ's Church and the practice of the church in divine worship.

The Roman Church's most authoritative voice on union thus brought to the United States both hope and a glimpse of the way for ultimate unity among Christians the world over.

## Writer Says Reds Shun Profit for Cuba's Untapped Minerals

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press article by Jesse Gordon, published on March 28 by the Record of Hackensack, N.J.

Mr. Gordon recently returned from Cuba with a report on Soviet mineral and oil explorations there, indicating the degree to which the Soviet Union may hold a mortgage on the resources of the island. He is listed by Andrew Tully in "CIA: the Inside Story," as one of the few expert observers on conditions within Cuba.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Mar. 28, 1963]

WRITER SAYS REDS SHUN PROFIT FOR CUBA'S UNTAPPED MINERALS; CLAIMS SOVIET MINING TECHNIQUES MAY SAVE CASTRO—FOR RUSSIA  
(By Jesse Gordon)

NEW YORK.—There is no special reason why I should have been chosen as the only

one of many newsmen in Cuba to be shown a Soviet technicians' new report on Cuba's mineral resources.

Suffice it to say that luck, a little adroit wire-pulling, and the affability of Dr. Augusto Henriquez, director of the Cuban Institute of Mineral Resources, conspired in my favor.

The report is a massive document, replete with maps, tables, and technical jargon. The portly, patient Dr. Henriquez—he works directly under Maj. Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Castro's righthand man—took 4 hours off a busy day to go over it with me in his office in the Jesus Menendez Building, located in downtown Havana.

"I am not an engineer," I said toward the close of the interview. "Yet, I see well enough that the Russians, in 18 months' time, have decided that they can get many times as much wealth out of your ground in a few years as American engineers have taken out of Cuba in half a century. How is that explained?"

Dr. Henriquez smiled, even more affably than usual, and raised an admonitory pencil. "Socialistic mining," he said, "is quite different from capitalistic mining. Capitalist mining only scratches the surface; socialist mining digs deeper."

At the time, the remarks seemed to me one of those Marxist clichés that spring so readily to the lips of a Communist. It was not until several months later, in New York, when I was showing my notes on the Soviet report to American mining engineers who had worked in Cuba under previous regimes, that I realized Dr. Henriquez had not been talking through his Marxist hat.

#### PROFIT MOTIVE

The American engineer scanned the tables I had copied on the Soviet estimates of Cuba's nickel, manganese, chromite, iron, and oil reserves.

"I'm prepared to accept these figures," he said. "They seem high, but not implausible. We've always known there was a lot of stuff down there."

"Then why, didn't you take it out?" "We took out only what we could sell at a profit," he answered. "That's what mining outfits are in business for. Generally speaking, the farther down you have to go for your ore, the more it costs you to bring it to the surface. Cuba wasn't our only source for these ores; what we could get out of Cuba cheaper than elsewhere, we took out; when we could get the stuff cheaper elsewhere we stopped producing in Cuba."

But Socialist mining, when designed to achieve national security, or increased autonomy, takes little account of profits. The iron, manganese, chromite, oil, copper, and so forth that American miners have been spurning, may prove the salvation of Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

#### MAY AID CASTRO

Granting that most of these materials are now in surplus in the world and that something expensive to produce has little leverage—even for Socialists—in world markets where cheaper goods hold sway.

Still, these Cuban resources may—I don't say they will, but they may—enable Castro to solve the long-range economic problems that, in truth, present more peril to him than invasions from the United States.

And—a final irony—they may turn Cuba from an economic fief of the United States—which Cuba has been called for many decades—into a fief of the Soviet Union.

For all available data indicate that the Soviet Union will one day demand a reckoning from Castro for the estimated \$450 million in aid—industrial, military, and financial—that the Soviet Union has already poured into that country.

And available data indicate equally clearly that Cuba has neither the capital nor the technical know-how to exploit the mineral potential revealed in the Soviet report.

So the capital will come from the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.S.R. will hold a mortgage on every drop of oil, every ounce of manganese, iron, nickel, cobalt, and copper drawn out of Cuba's earth.

## American-Canadian Relations Placed in Proper Perspective by Columnist Max Freedman

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 11, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, now that the Canadian election campaign is over, it is gratifying to know that the circumstances leading up to the fall of the Diefenbaker government, and the subsequent election last Monday, have been placed in their proper perspective by the distinguished columnist, Canadian-born Max Freedman, who has a profound knowledge of United States-Canadian relations in particular, and foreign affairs in general. Mr. Freedman did this in his article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star last night. He discusses our longstanding American relations with Canada, praises President Kennedy's forbearance and reveals the true facts as he knows them. I ask permission to have Mr. Freedman's article printed with my remarks at this point:

KENNEDY AND CANADA'S ELECTION—PRESIDENT'S FORBEARANCE PRAISED AS TIME COMES TO REPAIR POLITICAL DAMAGE

(By Max Freedman)

The worst election in Canada's history has now come to a weary and inconclusive result. Lester B. Pearson and the Liberal Party have emerged from the election with a doubtful mandate.

He will be able to lead Parliament only if the new Democratic Party, which is opposed to his defense policy and is critical of many aspects of American leadership, is ready to support him. In the campaign itself, Pearson gained few laurels. His friends have always said he would be far better in office than on the hustings. Now at last he has his chance.

Not even the personal courage and tenacity with which Prime Minister John Diefenbaker waged his campaign can be allowed to obscure the shameful nature of his appeal to the Canadian people. For the sake of victory in an election, he made charges that have hurt Canadian-American relations beyond all precedent.

If Canadian public life were in a healthy and normal mood, instead of being suspicious and inflamed, such a contemptible campaign would have been visited with the angry rebuke of the voters.

The size of Diefenbaker's vote, and his apparent willingness to try another desperate flirtation with the Social Credit Party, now shrunk to a fretful protest movement in Quebec, indicate the tragic prejudices that are demoralizing public debate in Canada.

It is the aspect of the election that requires the most patient and thoughtful attention of policymakers in Washington.

No doubt President Kennedy and his advisers will move swiftly to wipe out the ugly legacies of this campaign, to the extent that wisdom and generosity can achieve this reconciliation, and will wish to restore Ca-

6170

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 15

posal calling for the joint destruction by fire of American and Russian bombers.

In the Illinois speech, and later on the floor of the Senate, GOLDWATER described the "bomber bonfire" plan as "crazy" and demanded that the American people had the right to know about such idiotic schemes being hatched by the administration.

No sooner had GOLDWATER stepped down from the rostrum than half a dozen administration officials began issuing denials. "No such plan has ever been considered," they said. "It's all in the Senator's mind. Mr. GOLDWATER is imagining things."

It seems now that the story wasn't just a figment of the Arizona Senator's imagination. A story in the New York Times discloses that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has now admitted there has indeed been such a proposal for "bomber bonfires." He also confessed that the proposal was not merely discussed within the disarmament agency, but that it had been making the rounds of other departments and was being seriously considered as a step to break through the deadlock in arms negotiations with the Soviets.

The specific plan calls for the United States to burn 30 B-47 bombers per month, in return for the destruction by the Russians of 30 TU-16 Badger bombers. An embellishment on the idea was for both nations to fly the planes to some neutral site and to destroy them under the supervision of observers from neutral nations.

A spokesman for the disarmament agency has defended the plan by saying: "It seemed like a good idea." He went on to say that it was felt the move at least would "create some movement in the field of disarmament."

There you have it, in a nutshell. These frustrated disarmament negotiators haven't got the heart to admit that it is highly improbable that the Soviet Union will ever agree to any workable disarmament proposal which contains solid guarantees protecting the security of this country.

Of course, these people have jobs and a lot of spare time on their hands. And so they have been turning to the old pastime of straw grasping, coming up with gimmicks and trying desperately to "create some movement" for the sake of movement.

That's not what we need. If we are ever going to reach any kind of acceptable disarmament agreement with the Soviets, our negotiators have to be as tough and stubborn as theirs. They will have to outline our minimum terms and stick to them, not run helter-skelter in search of new gimmicks and concessions whenever the Russians say "Nyet."

The "bomber bonfire" proposal—as silly as it is—stands out as a symptom of decay in our national will to win. It ranks with the "study" reportedly undertaken a few years ago in the Pentagon to determine methods and procedures by which the United States would surrender to a conquering enemy, when and if we should lose our next war.

Senator GOLDWATER deserves credit for smoking out the arsonists on this one and putting out their little bonfire. He has illustrated that we not only have to keep our powder dry these days, but we also have to keep the firehose ready.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask the Senator if there is anything in the newspaper article to which he has referred which would indicate that, as a part of the rumored undertaking, an agreement would be made which would be subject to approval or rejection in the Senate?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I read the article twice, but I did not see anything in it on that point. However, I am convinced that under the powers that we have given the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, such a proposal would not have to meet with the customary Senate approval. I hope I am wrong, but I believe the Executive does have those powers.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hope, too, that my friend is wrong on that point. While we all know that the so-called theory of executive agreements has been indulged in for the past three decades as a basis for agreements of presumably slight importance or of temporary concern, I still do not like them. In any event, I do not want any agreement resulting from any part of any disarmament or arms control negotiation to bypass the Senate in any fashion whatsoever. In my judgment, the American people are passionately devoted to the constitutional responsibility of the Senate of the United States. They believe, as I believe, that the Senate should have the opportunity to approve or reject agreements entered into between our Government and foreign nations no matter what President is in the White House.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to quickly sum up—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Our Government did not seek the advice and consent of the Senate on the question of the removal of missiles from Turkey or Italy. I am not sure that we were consulted in the instance of their being put into those countries. Also I understand that, contrary to an existing agreement and understanding, our Government did not confer with the governments of NATO before that action was taken. So I am glad that the Senator from California has injected a constitutional warning.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. My time has expired. I do not have the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California have raised an important question. The disposition of defense forces, unconnected with an agreement between the Soviet Union or any other country and our own, is within the power of the President as Commander in Chief. The President might very well withdraw or commit forces any place in the world.

However, the Senator from California is absolutely correct that if the disposition, change, or a destruction of our

forces, planes or other elements of our defense is connected with an agreement with the Soviet Union bearing upon disarmament, then I certainly would say that would be an agreement which I believe would have to be submitted to the Senate for a two-thirds vote.

## RECLAMATION BENEFITS STILL TO COME

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there appeared in the Arizona Daily Star of Thursday, April 4, an editorial entitled "Reclamation Benefits Still To Come."

The editorial quotes the U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, concerning the extraordinary benefits which Federal Reclamation developments have brought to the Lower Colorado River Basin.

More importantly, the article points up the growing and critical situation which we, in water short areas of the Nation, face, and the measures which we must anticipate to solve it.

Because this same situation also exists in other parts of the Nation as the result of expanding population and increased per capita use of water, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the Record, that all may read how we are facing up to our water problems in Arizona.

The editorial is also a part to the bill S. 2, which is now unfinished business of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## RECLAMATION BENEFITS STILL TO COME

The U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation is authority for the statement that developments under the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado River and its tributaries serve 2,212,000 acres of arable land producing crops worth \$345.6 million last year. The past benefits are undeniable; the future can be made just as sure.

Reclamation means not only building large dams, such as Hoover, Davis and Glen Canyon—there are few such sites left anywhere in the United States, and only a couple on the lower Colorado River. Reclamation also means studies aimed at controlling evaporation, desalting brackish or salt water and doing many other things to protect and preserve the water supply for the wisest of human use.

Tucson has a tremendous stake in this because this city presently is using pumped water—water that comes from a considerable distance underground. The basin may be vast; no one knows exactly how vast. But pumping is almost always a mining operation, and Tucson's water to a large share is fossil water, laid down in the basin eons ago. A new source of water will be needed before many years pass.

## A PROPOSAL FOR LIBERATING CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last week the esteemed David Lawrence wrote an article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "A Proposal for Liberating Cuba." In his article he outlines a program for liberating Cuba which someone has suggested to him.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6169

Labor cannot be given every advance asked for and not have those advances be demonstrated in higher prices, unless those increases are called for by productivity advances. Likewise, prices cannot be advanced without market justification and still have stability prevail.

The President's present attitude toward the announced steel price increases is commendable; and it is to be hoped that he will continue on this enlightened trail. I ask that his entire statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE: STATEMENT BY THE  
PRESIDENT

This administration is watching closely the possibilities of a general across-the-board price increase in steel. I opposed such an increase last year—I oppose such an increase now.

This administration is not interested in determining the appropriate price or profit levels of any particular industry. We are interested in protecting the American public, and it is the American public which would suffer most from a general increase in steel prices.

It would invite another inflationary spiral in place of the present wage price stability. It would hamper our export expansion and increase import competition. It would adversely affect our balance-of-payments position on which our worldwide commitments depend. It would reduce the gains of our economic growth and reduce job opportunities in this country.

This Government in the past year has taken major steps to improve the economic position of the steel industry and assist in its modernization. Depreciation and investment tax benefits of some \$100 million were provided in 1962 to the steel industry alone; and its increased cash flow has made possible a planned increase in plant and equipment investment more than twice the national average. Additional tax gains will be realized in this year's tax reduction program.

I therefore strongly urge the leaders of the steel industry to refrain from any across-the-board price increases which will aggravate their competitive position and injure the public interest. The steel industry—which has been hard hit by competition from lower priced substitute products and foreign producers—has been operating far below capacity. What it needs is more business at competitive prices not less business at higher prices.

I urge similar restraint on the Steel Workers Union. With over 100,000 steelworkers still unemployed, their need is for more jobs with job security, not fewer jobs at higher wages. Across-the-board price increases could precipitate labor demands and unrest that would cause great difficulties for the country.

I realize that price and wage controls in this one industry while all others are unrestrained would be unfair and inconsistent with our free competitive market—that unlike last year the Government's good faith has not been engaged in talks with industry and union representatives—and that selected price adjustments, up or down, as prompted by changes in supply and demand, as opposed to across-the-board increases, are not incompatible with a framework of general stability and steel price stability and are characteristic of any healthy economy.

In a free society both management and labor are free to do voluntarily what we are unwilling to impose by law, and I urge the steel industry and the steel union to avoid

any action which would lead to a general across-the-board increase. I urge this in their own enlightened self-interest and in the public interest as well.

## DISARMAMENT STORIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several weeks ago I asked a question of the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency relative to a plan I had heard discussed that would cause the United States to contribute 30 B-47's to an equal number of Badgers by the Russians, all planes to be destroyed, as a gesture toward disarmament. At first the Agency denied there was this plan, then under questioning by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Secretary Rusk admitted it existed. I have been thinking about it since that time, and the more I pondered it, the less important 30 airplanes became, so I began to wonder if it might not involve a plan of broader dimension, say 30 of these aircraft a month for 30 of the Russians. Sure enough, the New York Times of April 3, under the byline of Hedrick Smith, stated that the proposition, which is still in "study stage," calls for United States to burn 30 B-47's a month in return for the destruction by the Russians of an equal number of their Badgers.

Now once again I must ask the Disarmament and Controls Agency if the Times is correct and, if it is, could they spell out for the Congress and for the American people just what the total is that they have in mind. If this continues for 2 years there would not be enough of a B-47 fleet left to call it by that name, and we would have gotten rid of this weapon 2 or 3 years before the phasing out would call for their final removal.

I have often stated that we are engaged in unilateral disarmament, and if this proposed action as reported by the Times is true, it once again confirms it. Once we have destroyed our manned bombers we will be on a parity with Russia when her superior ground forces, and at least equal missile forces will put the balance of power on her side. If we were planning new manned aircraft into our inventory, the Agency's proposal might make sense, but because we are not, it makes nonsense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the article from the New York Times to which I referred, and an editorial from the Dallas Morning News.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1963]  
ARMS PLAN DRAWS GOLDWATER SCORN—PROPOSAL TO BURN OBSOLETE BOMBERS IS ASSAILED

(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona has criticized the U.S. Disarmament Agency for a plan to propose to the Russians the joint burning of obsolete bombers.

The agency was carefully checking out the "bomber bonfire" plan with other agencies and key leaders on Capitol Hill, when the Arizona Republican assailed it.

The proposal, which is still in the study stage, calls for the United States to burn 30 B-47 bombers a month in return for the destruction by the Russians of an equal number of their TU-16 Badger bombers.

Officials conceived the idea to head off Soviet "dumping" of such obsolescent aircraft in trouble spots such as Middle East and southeast Asia. The United States, they observed, is already phasing out its B-47 fleet, so the exchange would not involve a sacrifice.

## "CRAZY" PLANS DEcriED

Initially, Senator GOLDWATER's criticism in a speech at Aurora, Ill., on March 9 brought carefully phrased denials that such a proposal was being offered the Russians.

Later, there was acknowledgment from Secretary of State Dean Rusk that such a plan "has been discussed inside the Disarmament Agency and with the [other] departments as one possible step which might at some stage be seriously considered."

Senator GOLDWATER followed up with a speech on the Senate floor March 21 asserting that public's "right to know about any and all crazy disarmament plans that are being hatched within this Government."

The Senator's attacks have baffled disarmament officials, who felt they had come up with a reasonable suggestion that was winning favor on Capitol Hill.

"It's pretty rough to be attacked on something that may not even see the light of day," said Nedville E. Nordness, public affairs spokesman for the Disarmament Agency.

"It seemed like a good idea. It would not be a gimmick or a phony. We felt it was a measure consistent with national security which might create some movement in the field of disarmament."

## NEUTRALS' SUPERVISION WEIGHED

The idea was that since the United States and Soviet Union are phasing out their medium range B-47 and Badger bombers, they might conceivably agree to fly them to a neutral site and destroy them at a given rate under the supervision of neutral observers.

"One of the elements of this sort of an idea," Secretary Rusk told Senators, "is to be sure to limit the extent which weapons which are highly sophisticated, but which become obsolete [between the major powers] . . . do not find themselves spread all over the world and become a part of other arms races . . . and do not feed out into a lot of countries which would find them a burden and would stimulate the dangers elsewhere."

Officials said they had checked out the plan with such Senators as WILLIAM FULLBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, and Republican JOSEPH S. CLARK of Pennsylvania without running into opposition.

Already the Soviet Union is reported to have begun selling Badgers, twin-jet medium bombers, to the United Arab Republic, Indonesia and Iraq. Informed sources report that each of the first 2 countries have received fewer than 10 of the planes and that Iraq may have received 2 with more to come.

The Soviet Union has sold other aircraft, such as Mig-15, Mig-17, Mig-19, and Mig-21 fighters and IL-26 bombers to Cuba and to several countries in the Middle East and Asia.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 5, 1963]

## BOMBER BONFIRES

Several weeks ago, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, thought he had a big one. In a speech he delivered in Aurora, Ill., the Senator said that he had been informed the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was preparing a pro-



In the course of the article, Mr. Lawrence implies that there has yet not been anybody who has recommended a course for the liberation of Cuba. I wish to invite the attention of this very esteemed writer to the fact that on the 22d of last month I made a rather lengthy, and I thought rather logical, speech outlining what I considered to be a sensible course of action for this Government to follow if it really thought Cuba should be liberated—which I think it does. I urge an examination of what I recommended, in the behalf that it is the only logical and practical way we shall ever accomplish getting rid of communism and Fidel Castro from Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**A PROPOSAL FOR LIBERATING CUBA: U.S. OFFER OF COMPLETE REHABILITATION IS URGED TO WIN SUPPORT OF PEOPLE**

(By David Lawrence)

Strangely enough, a comprehensive plan that could really help to overthrow Fidel Castro and liberate Cuba has never been formally presented to the world by the United States.

In conformity with international law, and without involving in any way the use of American troops or invading armies from the outside, a plan could be devised that would appeal today to every man and woman on the island of Cuba. The expression of their concerted will could end the Castro regime.

The plan would cost money—maybe a half billion dollars a year for 5 years or more. But that's a lot less expensive than the loss of human lives in even a limited war. Besides, it could hardly provoke that awful nuclear war which is so often cited as the reason for American forbearance, if not timidity.

The liberation plan would require, first of all, the appointment by President Kennedy of a special commission of Americans familiar with the economic capacity and potential of Cuba. The Commission would make a detailed report recommending a broad-scale program for the rehabilitation of Cuba. This would spell out exactly how many new jobs would be created and what the probable range of wages would be for various types of workmen in Cuba.

The program would, of course, be basically agricultural and would outline the ways by which the whole Cuban farm industry could be rehabilitated and what this could mean to the average farmer. Cost figures, however, would be included for each segment of the economy. The whole thing is in line with the fundamental principles of the Alliance for Progress scheme that has been so widely publicized.

When the "liberation" plan for Cuba is ready for announcement, it can be turned over to the U.S. Information Agency and its numerous outlets for radio broadcasting. A detailed report, covering as many phases of Cuban economic life as possible, should be presented in Spanish to the Cuban people. It should be expressed in the simplest phrases, so that the average person in Cuba could quickly grasp what is really meant. The mere announcement of the plan would cause a sensation inside Cuba, and the news of it would spread quickly over the island by word of mouth.

But, it will be asserted, the Cuban army has been trained by the Russians, and is estimated at a strength of about 200,000. No

revolutionist group is strong enough, it will be contended, nor in possession of adequate arms to do the job of defeating the Castro army. But this kind of argument assumes that a revolution in Cuba has to start with an organized revolutionary movement of substantial size. Actually, the most successful and far-reaching revolutions against autocracy in Europe and Latin America and Asia in recent years have come from inside the armed forces.

In Cuba, the 200,000-man army is an integral part of a large population, and its members have relatives and friends throughout the island. They are all aware of the suffering that prevails and the hopelessness of the future under Mr. Castro. Given a chance to rescue their countrymen, this same standing army could quickly take charge and get rid of Mr. Castro. A whole army can suddenly shift its allegiance at the behest of a few officers.

Unfortunately, in recent months the Washington Government's policies have created the impression inside Cuba that the United States is afraid to give Cubans any substantial help. It is true that more than \$50 million was raised to ransom the patriots who invaded Cuba in the Bay of Pigs episode, but the Cuban people now have been told that no raiders are to be permitted to go from American shores into Cuba. All this implies that there will be no help of a military nature forthcoming, either directly or indirectly. It creates discouragement and certainly doesn't make Cubans feel they will be helped if they do rise against Mr. Castro.

The only way to take over the government of Cuba is from within, and this depends on an aroused and unified public sentiment. Since economic difficulties are the most pressing at present, it is logical to expect that the Cuban people will be attracted by the publicized pledges of financial and economic assistance from the United States which the proposed plan would give them. It would open up a new era of hope for everybody.

As every individual translated the American economic plan into what it would mean to him and his family—the chance to earn decent wages and have a free government—public sentiment under a barrage of publicity would grow to such an extent that thousands in the army would themselves privately embrace it and seek ways to get a new government so that the American plan could be put into effect.

But without any plan at all for the future, and without any concrete offer of assistance of any kind from the United States—except some vague phrases in official utterances—the people of Cuba, and particularly the 200,000 men in the Cuban army, can see no future for their country. That's why a plan that is repeated over the radio day after day could become the very weapon that would get rid of Mr. Castro as well as the Soviet troops. The revolution would restore Cuba's place in the Organization of American States and give her an opportunity to become a participant with the other Latin American countries in the Alliance for Progress.

**FEDERAL FINANCE**

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post and Times Herald there is an article written by Mr. Harold B. Dorsey which is entitled "Critics Miss Point on Federal Finance," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**CRITICS MISS POINT ON FEDERAL FINANCE**

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

There is a propensity among critics of government expenditures and taxes to concentrate on the Federal Government's financial operations and to ignore those of the State and local governments. There have been instances where the word "government" has been used so loosely that the Federal Government tends to be criticized for State and local government actions.

In the 5 years through 1962, the number of workers on the Federal Government payroll increased 124,000 (5.6 percent). The number of employees on the payrolls of State and local governments increased by 1,435,000 (26 percent). State and local government workers outnumbered Federal employees by 2.9 times last year.

Federal Government debt in the same 5-year period increased about 14 percent. The debt of State and local governments increased by about 55 percent. On a cash basis, Federal Government expenditures in the same period increased about 34 percent and the State and local government expenditures increased 43 percent. Furthermore, the increase in the Federal expenditures includes substantially larger grants-in-aid to the State and local governments.

When we think of government levies siphoning off an increasing proportion of the productive efforts of the nongovernment economy, perhaps we should note that, on a cash basis, Federal receipts increased by approximately 27 percent in the 5 years through 1962, whereas the State and local government receipts increased by about 43 percent.

Five years ago (1957), Federal Government purchases of goods and services accounted for 11.8 percent of total gross national product and last year the proportion was 11.3 percent. The proportion for similar State and local government purchases was 8.3 percent in 1957 and increased to 10.3 percent last year.

It is quite clear then that in all of these measurements of employment and fiscal operations, the State and local government figures have been rising much more rapidly than those of the Federal Government. I doubt that there is a broad comprehension of these facts. This is unfortunate because it leads to many misunderstandings in the interpretation of business and government statistics.

For example, the Federal tax burden is not difficult to follow—and to criticize—because the bulk of it consists rather simply of income and social insurance taxes. The bulk of the States revenues comes from property taxes and from various types of sales and excise taxes, and license fees. Most of the sales and excise taxes are directly added to the price of goods and services sold and tend to be overlooked. Some portion of the increase in the cost-of-living index is caused directly by these taxes.

The rising importance of State and local government activities vis-a-vis the Federal Government deserves more attention in the projections of business prospects. Business analysts labor over the economic effects of Federal receipts and expenditures, but usually do not have a proportionate interest in the same figures for the State and local governments.

Similarly, the effect of Federal debt on the banking structure is analyzed carefully with little thought being given to the effects of State and local government deficit financing. In the past 18 months there has been little change in the commercial bank holdings of Federal securities whereas their holdings of State and local government issues have been rising quite sharply.

There is not enough space here to even tabulate the economic, sociological and political interpretations that are distorted by

a failure to comprehend the rapidly changing relationship between the Federal Government's financial operations and those of the State and local governments.

One small item occurs to me that may be germane to the current situation. The beneficial effects of a reduction of, let us say, \$10 billion in Federal income taxes are likely to be offset, in part, by the steady increase in the tax burden of State and local governments, even though these latter levies may be fairly well hidden in sales and excise taxes that increase the prices of commodities and services.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I think the article is worthy of the attention of Members of Congress, because it points out in a clear fashion how the cost of State and local governments has risen over the past 5 years, until it is much greater than the cost of the Federal Government; and how it is entirely possible, if the State and local governments continue this increased cost, this might well negate the proposed \$10½ billion tax cut which Congress currently is considering.

I commend the article to the attention of all Members of Congress.

#### EYES OPEN ON CUBA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there was published in the Birmingham News an unusually thoughtful editorial. In fact, I think it is one of the best thought-out statements on the Cuban situation I have yet read. It is entitled "Eyes Open on Cuba." I invite the attention of Senators to the editorial; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EYES OPEN ON CUBA

BARRY GOLDWATER said over the weekend that he favors an economic blockade of Cuba and U.S. support of Cuban exile raids—active support, including airdrops, for example, if an exile invasion of Cuba were undertaken—in preference to the Kennedy administration's position that blockade would run a war risk and the exile raids can do more harm than good.

As a last resort, Senator GOLDWATER said, he favors an invasion to rid the island of Communists. He thinks the effort should be multilateral—that is, involving the Organization of American States—instead of purely a U.S. undertaking.

This sort of talk will find a wide sympathetic audience among Americans chafing under a feeling of relative do-nothingism about Castro. The administration's policy is not do-nothing—it is simply do-something-else, the "something else" being diplomatic and economic pressure as alternative to direct action.

The indirect approach may or may not work, we may or may not have to resort to direct action sooner or later—but should that time come, we should make our decision in full knowledge of what it involves, not as a result of political haranguing.

This becomes especially pertinent as time for the more formal kind of campaigning approaches. As weeks and months pass toward 1964, abstract arguments will evolve into solid campaign issues. We should be careful not to paint ourselves into a corner—either corner—with the brush of political oratory.

It would not be wise to limit ourselves to any particular strategy and advertise the fact of our limitation to our adversaries. Our

policy should remain flexible, as it might not if politics makes us choose up sides with the winner bound to one approach to the exclusion of all others. David Lawrence in his column on this page today gives an example of fresh thinking about Cuba approaches. His suggestion merits study.

It may well be that indirect action will fail to bring about Castro's downfall in Cuba or the removal of Russian troops. But when we set out to do so directly, as Senator GOLDWATER suggests, let us not fool ourselves about what we're getting into.

If it comes to invasion, it would be foolish to proceed in belief that "we can accomplish it without having to commit our own troops," as the Arizonaan says he believes. We might get some help from Latin American OAS members, but by no stretch of the imagination could they be expected to carry the load alone. Neither should we smugly assume that we can send a division of marines ashore and have matter neatly tidied up by sundown. If we commit ourselves militarily, let's do so in full awareness that it's going to cost us dearly.

Senator GOLDWATER also shrugs off any idea such action on our part would bring on a world war—"Russia is not going to risk losing her world empire over a tiny island in the Caribbean," he said Sunday. Maybe not. But there is a risk, at least, that the Senator is wrong. We would have to be aware of that.

None of this is to say that direct action will not become necessary sometime in the future, or that we should avoid it for fear of what it might bring. It is only to suggest that we keep our eyes—and our minds—wide open and act accordingly.

#### THE INCENTIVE OF THE INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR TAX PURPOSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last week I made some comments about the wisdom of the administration in recommending the investment credit and the manner in which the adoption of that investment credit in our tax laws has served to encourage manufacturers to make capital expenditures of large sums of money, which, of course, have the result of strengthening our economy and providing additional jobs for the people in our economy.

I should like to add to what I said on that occasion by reading some excerpts from a column which appeared in the Wall Street Journal last Friday:

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. reports orders received in the first quarter were a full 42 percent higher than in the like 1962 period. The spurt reflects "a more promising capital goods climate, due partly to more favorable depreciation rules and tax credits," says a spokesman for the Milwaukee producer of construction equipment, farm machinery and other industrial equipment. Bookings of International Harvester Co. were up substantially in March from the previous month and from March 1962, reports an official. Recently introduced models of trucks and construction machinery are spurring the rise, he says.

"March was a banner month for incoming orders," says Galen Smith, president of Towmotor Corp., a Cleveland manufacturer of lift trucks and other materials handling equipment. Towmotor's order in the first 1963 quarter topped the previous record set in the first 3 months of 1962, Mr. Smith notes, despite the fact orders in the 1962 period were inflated by strikes in competitors' plants.

I could read further, though I shall not, to cite all the other companies listed

in the article, each of which indicates that the additional orders being placed by them and being placed with them are a direct result of the administration's highly fought over tax incentive credit of last year, as a result of which the 7-percent incentive credit was provided. This demonstrates, of course, the wisdom of the administration in recommending that particular proposal.

#### THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA IN THE DEFENSE OF THE NATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the national defense importance of the State of Florida was clear to the Nation during the Cuban crisis, and the people of the State responded, as freedom-loving Americans would be expected, to the unprecedented demand for the emergency buildup of military forces.

The Nation is also aware of the generosity and continuing sacrifice of the people of Florida in the handling of the Cuban refugee problem.

But Florida plays another role in the defense of the country, for both today and the future. In a recent speech to the officers of Patrick Air Force Base and the Atlantic Missile Range about the future of the Air Force in space, the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Eugene Zuckert, also talked about the present and future of the State of Florida in the defense of the Nation.

Everyone knows that Cape Canaveral is the principal launch site for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. But the complex of facilities along Florida's central east coast is also "the primary NASA-Air Force interface," in the words of the Secretary, where the foundations of defense capability of the free world in space are being laid.

Mr. Zuckert said the Air Force has two objectives in its space program. The first is to "acquire the capability to utilize space in support of military forces operating in the familiar environment of land, sea, and air," through improvements in observation, warning, military geodesy and meteorology. The second objective is to "acquire the necessary defense capability for the aerospace regions themselves."

Secretary of the Air Force said that both manned and unmanned systems will be required to "protect the peaceful activities in space of the nations of the free world."

The people of Florida are part of the great program at the Cape to assure freedom in space, and their contribution is important. Floridians are also equally proud of their contribution to and support of defense activities on Florida's west coast.

Mr. Zuckert explained the purpose of President Kennedy's expansion of our general purpose forces, to give the Nation a broader basis of deterrence of Communist aggression and a greater range of response to the Communist use of military force.

This calls for the combining of ground and air power through the new Strike Command, headquartered at MacDill Air Force Base on Florida's gulf coast.